3/19/70

Dear Paul and Gary,

Earlier today I mailed you the letter I wrote Rhoads after getting three so-called enlargements of CEs 394 and 395. They are les than 2x, which hardly qualifies as "enlarged" in the light on my request. When these are examined with an 8x lens, they are still clear, so I have little doubt greater enlargement is absolutely no sweat. My request was pretty specific, as you may recall. I therefore wonder why it was not followed. In this case I went to the trouble of spelling out my purposes. I find it increasingly difficult to believe all these things are accidental, the normal ineptitude of complascent bureaucracy.

Paul, you are the lay expert on the Freedom of Information Act. If you have any suggestions re: my today's letter to Rolapp on the Ferrie documents I would welcome them as soon as you can conveniently send them. I would not be very surprised if I were to hear from him in person rather than by letter on this also. You will note that there has been no communication on the Ferrie docs that invokves my lawyer, as there has been none on the panel report. This may make it easier for them to be informal. It may be assuming too much to assume he was shaken up when he looked into the panel-report business for himself. It may, in fact, be assuming too much to assume that he did this, as I urged. He could be just stalling me for three weeks. But by now he knows my seriousness because I have actually filed a suit. He knows also that after they gave me ample grounds for filing the suit I gave them two chances to eliminate the need. Maybe they can even do simple arithmetic, who knows? I would like to know how the argumant about the index strikes both of you. Snd Brener was a living doll, spelling it all out, in a nice, fat book. (I never hear of it, so it must be a bomb.)

There is another matter in which there is an outside chance you can help. You both get newspapers that have their own correspondents in Washington. If they ever carry anything over and above what the wire-services carry on the Rap Brown case and the related bombings, I will be quite anxious to have it. Something quite evil has already been prepared. I just do not know when it will be sprung or if it will be. It is entirely consistent with the doctrine of COUP. It is the little details that will interest me, those things attributed to the government, and anything that may, no matter how remotely, suggest either a frame or the preparation of any kind of case.

Have you realized how unusual it is for Hoover to be releasing even paraphrases of his "reports"? Now he is promising this service to everyone. He didn't find this necessary when hundreds of churches and synagogues were being bombed. In fact, while all this was going on a black church in Miss. was bombed into rubble for the heinous crime of permitting meetings of a federal-government program. But I have seen no such Hoover service or report or departure for his undeviating habit. I suggest this should be interpreted as significant. A not inappropriate context is administration political distress, on many fronts: economic, Carswell, SE Asia (they're really worried when their recognize their Cambodian rightist puppet in 24 hours and are the first government to do so), and many others not pointed out in the sycophant press. I have no doubt Rap Brown would be acquitted and I think they'd find that intolerable.

When I can I'll take the negative misidentified as made for Nichols to a photographer and have it enlarged to the size of the print I had made from the original negative in 1967. If possible, I'll have a picture taken. I expect to be able to use this for other purposes, but I rather suspect it will weaken the official fiction that we are denied certain things for their "security". Meanwhile, I have not gotten the picture they did take for Nichols. (Not long after I showed him mine, manwof honor that he is.) Sincerely,